

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
5

6 STEVEN ERIC GOULD

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 TRINITY SERVICE GROUP, INC., et al,

10 Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-00045-CDS-NJK

Order

[Docket Nos. 67, 69]

11 Pending before the Court are Plaintiff's motions for a settlement conference. Docket Nos.
12 67, 69. The Court has considered Plaintiff's motions and Defendants' response. Docket Nos. 67,
13 69, 92. No reply is necessary. The motions can be resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-
14 1.

15 Plaintiff requests the Court to set a settlement conference "in an attempt to close the
16 foregoing entitled action...." Docket No. 67 at 3; Docket No. 69 at 3. Defendants respond that
17 they "do not believe that a settlement conference would serve any useful purpose at this juncture."
18 Docket No. 92 at 1.

19 "The Court generally does not grant motions for settlement conferences that are opposed."
20 *McCarty v. Roos*, 2013 WL 5436578, at *2 (D. Nev. Sept. 27, 2013). Further, the Court is not
21 inclined to set a settlement conference that appears fruitless. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motions for
22 a settlement conference are **DENIED**. Docket Nos. 67, 69.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: September 13, 2022.

25 
26 NANCY J. KOPPE
27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28